

1 Alan D. Smith (WSBA 24964)
2 Bradley A. Cosman (*pro hac vice*)
2 PERKINS COIE LLP
3 1201 Third Avenue
3 Seattle, WA 98101
4 Telephone: (206) 359-8000
5 E-mail: ADSmith@perkinscoie.com
BCosman@perkinscoie.com

HON. WHITMAN L. HOLT

6 *Attorneys for Tyson Fresh Meats, Inc.*

7

8 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

10 In re:

11 EASTERDAY RANCHES, INC., *et al.*

12 Debtors

Chapter 11

Lead Case No.: 21-00141 WLH11
Jointly Administered

13
14
15 **OBJECTION TO MOTION TO
APPROVE SETTLEMENT WITH
COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING
COMMISSION UNDER FED. R.
BANKR. P. 9019**

16 Tyson's objection to the Motion¹ is limited to the circumstances for subordination of the
17 Restitution Obligation. Subordination of the Restitution Obligation under the Consent Order is
18 predicated on Tyson maintaining a separate and distinct general unsecured claim against
19 Ranches.² Indeed, Tyson has no objection to subordination of the Restitution Obligation so long
20 as Tyson maintains a direct general unsecured claim against Ranches.³ However, the Restitution
21 Obligation should not be subordinated if and to the extent Tyson's direct claim is subsequently
22 subordinated under Bankruptcy Code § 510(c) or disallowed under § 502(d).

24

25 ¹ *Motion to Approve Settlement with Commodity Futures Trading Commission Under Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9019* ("Motion") [Doc 1203]. Unless otherwise defined in this objection, capitalized terms
26 retain the definition given to them in the Motion.

27 ² Motion at p. 7, n. 4.

28 ³ Tyson filed Proof of Claim No. 61 in these cases on May 26, 2021 which asserts a general unsecured claim in the amount of more than \$232 million.

1 The Commodity Exchange Act (“**CEA**”) empowers the CFTC to bring an action against
2 any registered entity or person for violations of the CEA.⁴ Among the compliance remedies, the
3 CEA authorizes the CFTC to seek and the court to order “*restitution to persons* who have sustained
4 losses proximately caused by such violation (in the amount of such losses).”⁵ As one court
5 described it: “Restitution under the CEA is . . . *for the use and benefit of the persons who have sustained*
6 *losses* proximately caused by . . . violations of the CEA.”⁶

8 Consistent with the CEA’s express language in § 13a-1(d)(3)(A), courts consistently order
9 that the restitution payments awarded under the CEA be routed by the CFTC to the identified
10 victims who sustained the losses. *See, e.g., CFTC v. Arrington*, 998 F. Supp. 2d 847, 877-78 (D.
11 Neb. 2014) (ordering National Futures Association to oversee receipt of restitution funds for
12 CFTC and then distribute the funds to victims); *CFTC v. Millennium Trading Group, Inc.*, 2007
13 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 65784 at *34-35, Case No. 07-CV-11626 (E.D. Mich. Sep. 6, 2007) (same).

15 Here, the Restitution Obligation is based on losses sustained by Tyson due to Ranches’
16 violations of the CEA.⁷ Absent Tyson’s separate and direct claim against Ranches for the losses,
17 the CFTC would have the power to seek payment of the Restitution Obligation from Ranches
18 and the obligation to route restitution recoveries to Tyson. Tyson appreciates, however, that so
19 long as Tyson maintains a direct general unsecured claim against Ranches, subordination of the
20 Restitution Obligation is appropriate to avoid duplicative payment, dilution of pro rata payment
21 calculations, and class voting tabulation issues.

23

24 ⁴ 7 U.S.C. § 13a-1.

25 ⁵ *Id.* at § 13a-1(d)(3)(A) (emphasis added).

26 ⁶ *CFTC v. Escobio*, 946 F.3d 1242, 1252 n.10 (11th Cir. 2020).

27 ⁷ The exact amount of the Restitution Obligation (\$233,008,042) comes directly from Cody
28 Easterday’s criminal *Plea Agreement* where Cody Easterday agreed the restitution amount owed
to Tyson was \$233,008,042. Cody Easterday’s *Plea Agreement* is attached as Exhibit A to Tyson’s
Proof of Claim

1 But there should be no subordination of the Restitution Obligation to the extent Tyson's
2 direct claim were to be subordinated under Bankruptcy Code § 510(c) or disallowed under
3 § 502(d). This is because equitable subordination and disallowance—to the extent they apply at
4 all, which they do not—would be personal disabilities of Tyson that do not inhere in the
5 underlying claim.⁸ Said another way: CFTC's claim for restitution—which is a separate and
6 distinct claim of the CFTC—is not subject to equitable subordination or disallowance based on
7 the conduct of Tyson.

9 Tyson does not believe its direct claim is subject to subordination or disallowance, and
10 indeed believes any such contention would be frivolous. Tyson has been advised, however, that
11 the Ranches Committee continues to investigate such matters. Accordingly, the proposed
12 subordination of the Restitution Obligation presents a staging problem. Subordination of the
13 Restitution Obligation is appropriate to the extent it would lead to double recovery. But
14 unconditional subordination of the Restitution Obligation is inappropriate to the extent Tyson
15 is still exposed to subordination or disallowance. The estate should not be allowed to prejudice
16 Tyson by sequencing the matters in such a way.

17 For the reasons above, Tyson requests the court modify the subordination of the
18 Subordinated Restitution Claim⁹ to provide that the subordination is null and void to the extent
19 Tyson's direct claim against Ranches is subordinated or disallowed, and provide any further
20 relief the court deems just and proper.

21
22

23

24 ⁸ *See, e.g., In re Enron Corp.*, 379 B.R. 425 (S.D.N.Y. 2007) (finding equitable subordination
25 and disallowance are both personal disabilities that do not inhere in the claim; unless there was
26 a pure assignment of the claim, the claim in the hands of the transferee is not subject to equitable
subordination or disallowance based solely on the conduct of the transferor).

27 ⁹ Tyson does not object to the unconditional subordination of the separate Subordinated
28 CMP Claim which, as a claim for penalties, is properly subordinated under Bankruptcy Code
§ 726(a)(4).

